

Thank you for your comment, Claire Barker.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is SolarM60149.

Comment Date: August 31, 2009 12:30:29PM
Solar Energy Development PEIS
Comment ID: SolarM60149

First Name: Claire
Middle Initial:
Last Name: Barker
Organization:
Address: [Withheld by requestor]
Address 2:
Address 3:
City: [Withheld by requestor]
State: [Withheld by requestor]
Zip: [Withheld by requestor]
Country: [Withheld by requestor]
Email: [Withheld by requestor]
Privacy Preference: Withhold address from public record
Attachment:

Comment Submitted:

Hello-

I would appreciate it if our public lands were protected from development of any kind.

Solar development-while "greener" in SOME ways, on a utility scale basis: disrupts the landscape, denies access, develops access where none was and changes the shade/sun/water cycle so critical to many of the areas being "scoped". Thousands of solar panels precede the problem of removal of obsolete panels-which are toxic-and presently non-recyclable.

I fear greatly the setting of "precedence" through "NEED" under the guise of green energy. Denying known problems of environmental/socio-economic damage to communities affected and warping industrial sized solar development potential to fit a gas/coal model.

Solar is most effective close to its source of consumption. Utility scale or personal panel placement. ALL of Colorado (Western United States) has great solar potential and tracts of industrial land, private land and public right of ways perfect for locale community use-specific development.

Hurrying to seek a path of least resistance, under the pressure of federal and state scrutiny, will make it more difficult or impossible in the future, to mitigate applications for development of any and every kind on our gorgeous public lands.

Utility scale solar energy development-presently is tied into transmission line development.

Connecting large tracts of land, over miles of more land to reach each other. Toxic views, migratory and native bird threats, extension of development in even more "open space" beyond the immediate utility solar plant, and only token legal attention to environmental/socio-economic impacts of the communities and ecosystems involved.

The economic benefit to communities affected-specifically individuals who's property value plunges and community business economics-dependent on non-industrialized ambiance-are not well regulated or methodically re-imbursed for losses incurred secondary to solar and transmission development. Much falls under "eminent domain."

All industry-solar included-require some water-if only to wash panels free of dust-which is plentiful in many of the scoped regions. Other technologies to provide storage capability of energy-utilize the equivalent in water consumption to present agri-business-BUT-utilizes it 12 months out of the year-instead of just three.

Unregulated or legal changes in regulations of water use-make sunny, arid climates very vulnerable to continuing water issues that devastate the local eco-systems. The agricultural industry is already struggling with this issue, another "layer" of industrial usage permits would be paradoxical under the guise of "green".

At present-I acknowledge that the energy industry/energy consumer is at a crossroads-under the time limit of legal change in Colorado-to increase "green energy consumption and development by 10%.

We are also at a crossroads where moving too fast and in the "path of least resistance and cost" will cost our future generations dearly. We KNOW this-even though the technology is new-the pitfalls are predictable.

Let us NOT repeat history-please.

Uphold public lands for public enjoyment, open space, environmental sanctity and eco-system balancing. The issue is already difficult enough without adding another layer of potential problems.

Sincerely, Claire Barker